REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed December 7, 2007. Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, 15, 18, 21, 25-27, 29, 30, 36 and 44-52 stand rejected. In this amendment, claims 1, 17, 21 and 44 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. Claims 53 and 54 have been added. No new matter has been added.

Summary of Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-5, 15, 21, 25-26, 36, 44 and 46-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chacon, (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,588, hereinafter "Chacon"), in view of Floyd, et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0105355, hereinafter "Floyd").

Claims 6, 8-9, 27 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chacon, in view of Floyd, and further in view of Beauchesne, (U.S. Patent No. 5,777,876, hereinafter "Beauchesne").

Claims 17-18, 45 and 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chacon, in view of Floyd, as applied to claims 1-6, 13, 15-16, 21-22, 23-27, 34, 36-37, 42, 44 and 46-50 above, in view of Martorana, et al., (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0236628, hereinafter "Martorana").

Claims 1, 4-5, 15, 21, 25-26, 36, 44 and 46-50

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-5, 15, 21, 25-26, 36, 44 and 46-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chacon in view of Floyd. As amended, claim 1 recites:

> A method of storing information in a database to characterize attributes outputted by different classes of equipment, comprising:
> storing in a first database table of a database memory device a plurality of

attribute data records, wherein storing each attribute data record includes:

storing in that record a first field identifying a class of equipment;

storing in that record a second field identifying an attribute whose value is outputted by the class of equipment identified by the first field of that record, wherein said attribute is a sensor measurement or operating parameter of said class of equipment identified by said first field; and

storing in that record a third field specifying an ID which the class of equipment identified by the first field of that record assigns to the attribute identified by the second field of that record; and

storing in a second database table that is a child table of the first database table a plurality of subordinate data records, wherein storing each subordinate data record includes:

storing in the subordinate data record one or more subordinate fields that are subordinate to the second field of an attribute data record;

wherein the first field, second field, third field and one or more subordinate fields, in combination, define communications interface specifications that enable a diagnostic apparatus to retrieve distinct attribute information from distinct classes of equipment.

(emphasis added).

Chacon teaches a scheduler database that stores production models and data for simulation. The scheduler database obtains all data for simulation **from a manufacturing execution system** entitled PROMIS. (Chacon, col. 3, lines 58-65; col. 14, lines 18-36; col. 16 lines 63-66). The scheduler database does not obtain data from manufacturing equipment. Nor does the scheduler database include fields that define communications interface specifications. Nor does the scheduler database teach a first field, second field, third field and one or more subordinate fields that in combination define a communications interface specification. In contrast, claim 1 recites, wherein the first field, second field, third field and one or more subordinate fields, in combination, define communications interface specifications that enable a diagnostic apparatus to retrieve distinct attribute information from distinct classes of equipment.

Floyd teaches a database 400 that includes a product table 410, a result table 430, a process table 450, and an equipment command and communication table 500. (Floyd,

paragraph [0139]; Figures 12-14). However, Floyd fails to teach a first field, second field, third field and one or more subordinate fields that in combination define a communications interface specification. Therefore, Floyd fails to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1 that are missing from Chacon.

Neither Chacon nor Floyd, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance, and request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be removed.

Claims 21 and 44 include the language, "wherein the first field, second field, third field and one or more subordinate fields, in combination, define communications interface specifications that enable a diagnostic apparatus to retrieve distinct attribute information from distinct classes of equipment." As noted above, neither Chacon nor Floyd, alone or in combination, teach or suggest such limitations. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully assert that the present invention as claimed in claims 21 and 44, and their corresponding dependent claims, is patentable over the cited references.

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.

Claims 17-18, 45 and 51-52

Claims 17-18, 45 and 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chacon, in view of Floyd, as applied to claims 1-6, 13, 15-16, 21-22, 23-27, 34, 36-37, 42, 44 and 46-50 above, in view of Martorana.

Chacon teaches a scheduler database that stores production models and data for simulation. The scheduler database obtains all data for simulation **from a manufacturing execution system** entitled PROMIS. (Chacon, col. 3, lines 58-65; col. 14, lines 18-36; col. 16 lines 63-66). The scheduler database does not obtain data from manufacturing equipment. Nor does the scheduler database include fields that define communications interface specifications. Nor does the scheduler database teach a first field, second field, and third field that in combination define a communications interface specification. In contrast, claim 1 recites, wherein the first field, second field, and third field, in combination, define communications interface specifications that enable a diagnostic apparatus to retrieve distinct attribute information from distinct classes of equipment.

Floyd teaches a database 400 that includes a product table 410, a result table 430, a process table 450, and an equipment command and communication table 500. (Floyd, paragraph [0139]; Figures 12-14). However, Floyd fails to teach a first field, second field, and third field that in combination define a communications interface specification. Therefore, Floyd fails to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 17 that are missing from Chacon.

Martorana teaches a navigation system for a drilling rig. The navigation system **does not include a database**. Moreover, Martorana fails to teach a first field, second field, and third field of a database record that in combination define a communications interface specification. Therefore, Martorana fails to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1 that are missing from Chacon and Floyd.

None of Chacon, Floyd or Martorana, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 17. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that Examiner remove his

rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to claim 17 and its dependent claims.

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT AUTHORIZATION

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 022666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Benjamin Kimes at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: February 1, 2008   _____/Benjamin A. Kimes/_____

Benjamin Kimes
Reg. No. 50,870

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300

Customer No. 008791